

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The term "routing" has been removed where it created confusion between the routing data and the content-related data.

The claims are rejected on US 6,332,163 of Bowman-Amuah. In this regard it is noted that Bowman-Amuah does not disclose the step of collecting in the interface components content-related data related to the association of the contents and the caches that contain them. While Bowman-Amuah may disclose that "each router periodically informs neighboring routers as to the contents of routing table," there is no teaching or disclosure in Bowman-Amuah of collecting in interface components content-related data that is related to the association of the contents and the caches which contain them.

Furthermore, in response to paragraph 7 of the Office Action we should highlight that in view of the correction of the above-mentioned error the independent claims now refer to "content-related-data" and not to "routing-content-related-data." The passage of Bowman-Amuah at page 116, lines 47-52, and the entire reference do not disclose "transferring routing data,

obtained by processing the content related data, from at least one of the interface components to the Directory Name Service or Domain Name Server of the respective network so as to update tables of the Directory Name Service or Domain Name Server" For example, there is no disclosure in Bowman-Amuah of processing content-related data so as to obtain routing data.

Furthermore it is noted that claim 20 recites, among others, "A method for implementing internetworking of a set of Content Delivery Networks each provided with ... interface components susceptible of being each associated with a respective network in the set of networks" "comprising the step of" "transferring routing data ... from at least one of the interface components to the Directory Name Service or Domain Name Server of the respective network so as to update tables of the Directory Name Service or Domain Name Server."

In Bowman-Amuah there is no disclosure of transferring routing data from an interface component of a Content Delivery Network to the Directory Name Service or Domain Name Server of the respective network (i.e., of the same Content Delivery Network). The Examiner notes that, according to Bowman-Amuah, once the interface is registered in the Naming Service, it has become globally addressable, and that any client can find the interface and access an operation. However, claim 20 is not directed to "a client finding the interface and accessing an operation". More

specifically, in this invention the interface is not used for allowing clients to access operations within the Content Delivery Network that is associated with the interface. To the contrary, in this invention as defined in new claim 20 the interface is used to provide routing data. This routing data derives from content-related data collected from other interfaces associated with other CDN that are internetworked with the first CDN. Once collected from the interfaces of different CDN's, this routing data is then transferred to a DNS (Directory Name Service or Domain Name Server) of the respective network, i.e. of the network that is associated with that first CDN. In other words, when an interface of a first CDN collects data (specifically, content-related data) from another interface of a different Content Delivery Network, it processes this data to obtain routing data therefrom. This routing data (related to routing information for content associated with the other CDN) is transferred to the DNS of the first CDN, i.e. the CDN associated with the interface. By making available the routing data relating to content associated with other CDN's into the first CDN, the invention allows access by the client of the respective network (i.e. of the first CDN) to contents of the networks in the set of CDN's, i.e. not only of the first CDN but also of other CDN of the set of CDN's, through the Directory Name Service or Domain Name Server of the first network.

These features are not disclosed nor implied in Bowman-Amuah, in particular it is not disclosed or implied in any of the passages mentioned by the Examiner in the Office Action. Although referring to new claim 20, the above arguments also apply to the Examiners' objections to the other independent claims 23 and 26. The remaining claims are patentable in view of their dependency on one of the independent claims.

Thus all the claims in the case are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

K.F. Ross P.C.

/Andrew Wilford/

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

26 September 2008
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure: Extension (three months)